UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,371	12/09/2003	Hong-Hsi Lo	ORACL-01416US1	4427

80548 7590 06/18/2009

Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street
14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

EXAMINER	
WANG, HARRIS C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2439	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,371	LO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HARRIS C. WANG	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-14,16-18,20-25 and 51-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20-25, 51-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/07/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has amended claim 10 to read "The system of claim 1, further comprising a user information cache that caches a copy of said user authentication information in case of a failure in a communication link between the firs type server and the second type of server."

Because the limitation does not actually perform any steps but addresses the intended use of caching the information, the new limitation will not be given patentable weight and will be treated as intended use.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the remaining claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 10 recite the limitation "said plurality of first type servers" and "said user authentication information." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20-25, 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (20030033535) in view of Fichtner (20030005297).

Regarding Claims 1, 13-14

Fisher teaches a system for single security administration comprising:

A first type server wherein the first type server includes an authentication server *("Fig. 2 shows a block diagram illustrating the architecture 200 of an exemplary common authentication protocol or proxy (CAP) server 40 according to one embodiment of the invention" Paragraph [0019]). The Examiner interprets the CAP server as the first authentication server. The Examiner interprets the "first type server" as the CAP server in conjunction with the plurality of Applications that may call it*

a plurality of second type servers, wherein each second type server includes an embedded server;; *("The architecture of the Cap server includes…an authentication interface which communicates with directory service backends including…LDAP" Paragraph [0019]) The Examiner interprets the authentication backend the second server.*

and each second type server is associated with a security data repository that provides to the second type server user security information associated with both the first type server and the second type server *("the CAP server will perform authentication by accessing the database of the appropriate authentication backend for the given application…it obtains the user or user group information it requires to perform authentication function from an external user or user group database contained in an authentication backend" Paragraph*

[0023]) The Examiner interprets the data repository as the database. The Examiner interprets the user security information as the authentication or credential information.

a default security plugin at said first server that receives authentication requests from clients and forwards them to said first authentication server; *("A user 30 wishes to begin an application 20 on the data processing system…The application 20 will send a request for authentication credentials 300 to the CAP server 40 (step 420) Paragraph [0021])* The Examiner interprets the application as the default security plugin that receives authentication requests from clients and forwards them to an authentication server.("Secure Channel from the Client…Security is provided by encapsulation at the transport layer so that alternate security methods may be used or "plugged in." Paragraph [0123]) *("The invention addresses the need to reduce user logon complexity at the desktop while offering the open architecture to integrate easily into current enterprise environments…CAP…allows applications to access existing directory service authentication backends" Paragraphs [0006-0007])*

wherein, in response to receiving a request for authentication from a client, the authentication server at the first type server determines which second type server stores security information for the particular user; the system initiates a session between said first server and said second server, passes query information from said LDAP authentication server to said embedded LDAP server, receives corresponding user information, *("The CAP server will perform authentication by accessing the database of the appropriate authentication backend 110 for the given application." Paragraph [0023])*

and creates a token that reflects an authentication result that can be used by said client. *("If the credentials are authentic, then the CAP server will return an authentication token to the application." Paragraph [0024])*

The Applicant's amendment of a "plurality of first type servers." As the purpose of Fisher is to connect a plurality of different application servers to a single authentication backend, Fisher anticipates "a plurality of first type servers. (See abstract or Figure 1)"

Fisher teaches wherein the first type server in combination with the CAP (Common Authentication Proxy) server connects with a LDAP authentication backend. *(See Figure 1, CAP, LDAP, also "The invention supports many different backent authentication directory services including…LDAP (Paragraph [0008])")* Therefore the CAP server (first type) acts as an LDAP authentication server.

Fisher does not explicitly teach wherein the first type server holds only access control list and relies on one of the plurality of second type servers to provide user and group information

Fichtner (2003/0005297) teaches wherein a first type server holds the access control list (ACL)and relies on one of the plurality of second type servers to provide user and group information *("Then based on each…backend server's sign-on credentials for each user or group, the administrator may…map application user identity to the backend HTTP server identity" Paragraph [0054])("The authentication server of the application then checks the requested Web Resource's ACL policy against the internal credential of the user to verify if access is allowed for the user" Paragraph [0056])* Therefore Fichtner teaches the authentication server holding the access control list and relying on the backend servers to provide group and user information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Fisher to include keeping the ACL at the first server and the group and user information at the second server.

The claim would have been obvious because a particular known technique (keeping the ACL in one server and user and group information in a second server) was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art.

Regarding Claims 3-5, 16-18

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1. Fisher teaches wherein the first server is an enterprise server (See Figure 1, Application **20** and CAP **40**.) Fisher teaches wherein said second server is an application server *("This architecture supports and takes advantage of existing enterprise user/group authentication backends 110" Paragraph [0126] of Fisher).*

As the first server serves the needs of an enterprise it is considered an enterprise server.

Regarding Claim 7, 20

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1 wherein said query information is query user information that specifies a particular user or group of users. *("In general, the CAP server…obtains the user or user group information it requires to perform its authentication function from an external user or user group database contained in the authentication backend" Paragraph [0023])(LDAP User Filter, LDAP Group Filter, Paragraph [0095-6] of Fisher)*

Regarding Claim 8, 21

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of servers

("The invention seeks to provide a method and system for user authentication in a data processing system wherein users only have to logon once, while being able to access multiple applications and servers" Paragraph [0006] Fisher)

Regarding Claim 9, 22

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 8 wherein at least one of said plurality of servers include an LDAP authentication server. *("LDAP Server Host" Paragraph [00941])*

Fisher does not explicitly teach where at least two servers include an LDAP authentication server.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include two LDAP authentication servers.

The motivation is that Fisher already teaches using multiple servers, including one LDAP server. The mere duplication of parts does not produce any unexpected results. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to add another LDAP server without altering the functionality of the system.

Regarding Claim 10, 23,

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1, further comprising a user information cache that caches a copy of said user information. *("the authentication token is generally stored in cache memory within the data processing system and is passed to each application that the user needs to access without the need to request new credentials each time" Paragraph [0030]) The Examiner interprets the authentication token as comprising use credentials.*

Regarding Claim 11, 24

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1. The Examiner asserts that any system which has multiple servers and is compatible with LDAP (including the system of Fisher) is scalable to include multiple LDAP authentication servers and/or multiple embedded LDAP servers.

Regarding Claim 12, 25,

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1 wherein at least one of said servers include a console program for administering the security of the system. *("The CAP server includes an administration system that provides a system administrator with the ability to change or configure the CAP server's properties. Configuration may be HTML based. The HTML page may be generated by a servlet. The administration screens may be accessible from a browser, and editor, or an enterprise information portal." Paragraph [0084]) The Examiner asserts that an administration system as described inherently requires a computer program.*

Regarding Claim 51,

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1, wherein: the user and group information is eliminated from the first type server. *(Figure 11, and associated text of Fichtner)*

Regarding Claim 52,

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1 wherein:

The session is a LDAP session that supports a single user security data store and administration *(Figure 1, "LDAP")*

Regarding Claim 54,

Fisher and Fichtner teach of claim 1, wherein:

The first type server also supports a separate independent authentication mechanism with a separate security repository *(Figure 2 shows multiple separate authentication mechanisms)*

Regarding Claim 55,

Fisher and Fichtner teach of claim 53, further comprising:

A migrating utility that takes user security information from the separate security repository associated with the first type server and updates the security data repository associated with at least one of the plurality of second type servers. *(Paragraph [0041] see the "import" operation)*

Regarding Claim 53,

Fisher and Fichtner teach the system of claim 1 wherein:

Fisher and Fichtner do not explicitly teach each of the plurality of second type of servers supports backup or failover authentication

The Examiner takes Official Notice that backup or failover authentication is well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the servers support backup or failover authentication.

The motivation is to provide support in case communication fails.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARRIS C. WANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EDAN ORGAD can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian LaForgia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Harris C Wang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2439